

IN SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES.

JANUARY 27, 1836.

Read, ordered to be printed, and that 5,000 additional copies be furnished for the use of the Senate.

Mr. EWING made the following

REPORT,

ON SENATE BILL NO. 40.

The Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred a bill to appropriate, for a limited time, the proceeds of the sales of the public lands of the United States, and for granting lands to certain States, report :

That they look upon the leading measure proposed by the bill as one of great national importance. The gradual operation of a system, devised in the early history of our Government, for the support of the public credit, and for reducing the public debt, has, within a short time past, produced its full and final effect. The public debt is discharged, and existing commercial regulations, which the condition of our country renders indispensable, together with the sales of the public lands, bring yearly a large surplus fund into the Treasury. This fund, which is no longer taken up in the payment of a national debt, and which still remains unappropriated, has already arisen to the amount of about twenty-four millions of dollars; and as it does not arise from transient causes, it goes on increasing, and must continue to increase. This state of things is not at all desirable. Its natural tendency is to produce extravagance in the appropriation and wastefulness in the expenditure of public money. Indeed, it seems to be conceded by all, that this large surplus ought not to remain and accumulate in the public Treasury; and there have been suggested, as means of lessening the amount and preventing a future accumulation—

First, The reduction of the customs;

Second, Increased expenditures in the navy and fortifications;

Third, A reduction of the price of public lands, and the surrender of large portions of them to the States in which they lie; and,

Lastly, This bill, which proposes to distribute the proceeds of the public lands among the several States, leaving the receipts from customs to defray the ordinary expenses of Government in time of peace.

The first-named measure—a reduction of the customs—cannot be resorted to without awakening feeling dangerous to the peace and harmony of the country. The tariff law now in force, is the result of a compro-

mise of the opinions of the citizens of different sections of the Union, and ought not to be disturbed, unless a strong political necessity call for its modification. Under this law, or, indeed, any law, keeping up such duties as are necessary for the proper regulation of commerce, it is believed that the customs will produce a revenue, at least equal to the ordinary wants of the Government. The surplus, therefore, cannot be reduced by lessening the amount of the customs.

The next measure proposed, is a large increase of appropriations upon our fortifications and navy, so as to absorb the surplus revenue, and at the same time put the country in an attitude of defence in the event of a foreign war. Such increased appropriation, to some extent, is, in the opinion of your committee, necessary and proper. There ought to be dealt out with a liberal hand, all that can be well applied to render the seaboard safe from foreign aggression ; but the amount asked by the Executive for both these purposes, does not, with the other current expenses of Government, exceed the probable receipts from customs for the ensuing year, if the country be not involved in war. And it is not, in the opinion of your committee, proper that an expenditure should be made in the construction of fortifications or naval armaments for the purpose of exhausting the surplus revenue. If it be, the expenditure of money is made at once the *primary object*, and the improvement of the national defences but subordinate or auxiliary thereto. This would be true in fact, as well as in form. If much money were expended, it would necessarily be applied to little purpose. We might on a sudden emergency, in a short time, by large expenditure, prepare fortifications which would serve the purpose of a temporary defence ; but all those substantial works which are to stand as our future and permanent fortresses require time, a selection of materials, and skilful engineers, which it is not in our power to supply much beyond what is necessary in expending judiciously and skilfully our ordinary appropriations. So, also, with respect to the navy.

But to this project there is another and a serious objection. The expenditures in support of the Government are, much the larger portion of them, upon our sea-coast, and in our great commercial cities. This proposed extraordinary expenditure would very much increase that amount, and draw to the sea-coast other large sums of money which ought properly to have a general distribution over the whole United States. Nor could we expect such a system, if once adopted, to cease, or even to diminish, for ages. No nation was yet ever known voluntarily to lessen its expenditures. If we commence a system of fortifications for the purpose of expending money, chiefly, and but in a secondary degree only, for defences, there will be no limit or end to the means it will furnish us of exhausting our national resources. Hundreds of millions may be expended with a tolerable show of public necessity or convenience, when it is not, on the other hand, deemed necessary to guard and to save the public treasure. It appears clear to your committee, therefore, that an amount of money large enough to exhaust the surplus revenue, could not, at present, be expended in this manner advantageously to the country.

The reducing of the price of the public lands and ceding them to the States in which they lie, is another mode proposed to lessen the receipts into the Treasury, and thus prevent the influx of a surplus revenue.

Propositions such as these were referred to the Committee on Man-

manufactures, at the first session of the twenty-second Congress, and on the sixteenth of April, eighteen hundred and thirty-two, they presented a detailed report to the Senate, in the general views and reasoning of which, your committee concur ; and they herewith present the same, and make it a part of their report. That paper, in the opinion of your committee, demonstrates the injustice and impolicy of such a disposition of the national domain ; and subsequent experience has confirmed their reasoning.

But other similar propositions, varying from those considered in that report, in some of their features, have been referred to your committee. Among these are—

A proposition to graduate the price of the public lands according to quality ; and

To grant the lands to the States in which they lie, after they shall have been offered for sale for a given time.

To each of these your committee have given a careful consideration.

These propositions appear to be suggested for the benefit of the States in which the public lands are situated, for it is easy to prove that the interests of the United States, as the great landed proprietor, would not be subserved by either of them. The graduation of the price of the public lands is in no wise necessary or expedient, as a measure to effect their sale. Lands which have been long in market become surrounded by settlements. If they be hilly, they become valuable for their timber and stone, and other mineral productions. If swampy, or barren, they form a convenient appendage to neighboring farms for pasturage ; and if not worth entering at the minimum price for any of these purposes, the public suffers no loss in permitting them to remain open and unappropriated.

Experience has fully shown, that the rise in the value of the public lands increases in proportion to the time that it is in market, or rather, to the number of the sales and density of the settlement near and around it. This fact is strongly illustrated by a reference to the sales of the public lands at the several land offices for a series of years. By this it will be seen that a larger per centum of the lands actually in market at private sale, has generally sold at the *old* than at the *new* offices, and that per centum has generally increased in proportion to the *time* the lands have been in market. It is a remarkable fact, bearing upon this proposition, that in no State or Territory, has the sales of public lands at private sale been so great in proportion to the quantity in market within the last five years, as in Ohio, in which State the public lands have been longest exposed to sale.

Your committee are also of opinion, that such graduation or reduction in the price of the public lands would operate to the injury, and not the benefit of the section of country in which such lands lie. If the amount of public land the price of which was thus reduced, be great, its first and immediate effect would be to reduce the value of all the lands in its vicinity, *pro rata* with the reduction of the public lands. To those who were full handed, and able to make large purchases, it might open a fine field for speculation, and profitable investment of capital, and if the price were reduced low, so as to make it an object with the capitalist, the public lands would be purchased up at once, on speculation, and retailed at

an advanced price. It would thus cause a fluctuation in the value of land, a fall and a rise in its price, which is ever favorable to the sharp-sighted and sagacious speculator, but inimical to the interests of the agricultural portion of the community. Your committee therefore think, that no interest which ought to be cherished and protected by the Government, requires the graduation of the price of the public lands.

The proposition to cede the public lands to the States in which they lie, after they shall have been offered for sale a given number of years, is liable to many and serious objections. This project is, no doubt, well calculated to meet with favor in those States in which there is yet much public land unsold, as it holds out to them an apparent prospect of a vast accession to their resources. But it is, in the opinion of your committee, entirely delusive. The several States which form parties to the national compact have all an equal right to, and an equal interest in, the national domain, and such an application of it to the use of some of the States, which is not just to all, cannot be expected to meet with general favor.

Such a disposition of the public lands would be, indeed, a violation of a solemn contract which was adopted by, and made binding under the constitution of the United States. The deed of cession of Virginia, by virtue of which we hold by far the largest and most valuable portion of our territory east of the Mississippi river, contains a clause, common to all the cessions of the several States, which provides that, after certain reservations shall have been made, and certain bounties satisfied, that the lands so ceded "shall be considered a *common fund* for the use and benefit of all of the United States, members of the federal alliance," "and shall be *faithfully and bona fide* disposed of for that purpose, and for no other use or purpose whatsoever." This deed of cession was made by Virginia and accepted by Congress prior to the adoption of the constitution. It therefore became and was a compact before the adoption of the constitution, and is referred to and made binding by the first section of the fifth article of that instrument. It is, in the opinion of your committee, too clear to require an argument, that the giving of all the residue of these lands to the States in which they lie, after they shall have been offered for sale for a period of years, will not, if any lands of value remain unsold, be disposing of them *bona fide*, for the benefit of all the States, according to the requisition of this solemn compact. The principle on which grants of land have been made to the several States in which the public lands lie, for public works of any kind, is, that the United States being a large landholder, have, in the management of that property, a right to do what any other landholder, who consulted his own interest, would do—appropriate a portion of his lands, or their proceeds, to open roads and canals, and to construct public works in their neighborhood, so as to enhance their value or bring them sooner to a market. But this proposed gift or cession of the residue of the lands, after they shall have been in market five or ten years, cannot be sustained on that ground. A gift or conveyance of *a part*, on condition that it be so applied as to make the *residue* more valuable than the whole would otherwise have been, is a *bona fide* disposition of such part of the fund for the use of all those who are entitled to share in it; but, if we give away the *whole residue* at any time, when that residue possesses value, we as certainly misapply the fund and abuse the trust; for, in that state

of things, nothing remains to be enhanced in value, and the gift is to *one* State or to a *few* States—whereas, the trust is for all, and Congress is required to dispose of the land *bona fide* for the benefit of *all*.

But, if Congress had the right to give the residue of the lands, after they should have been offered for sale five or ten years and still remain unsold, to the States in which they lie, such a disposition of them would be unequal among themselves, and therefore unjust. It would not give them lands in proportion to the population of each, or to the amount that each, or the citizens of each, had paid for lands into the public Treasury. The State of Ohio would receive, on this proposition, certainly less than four millions of acres, (the amount depending upon the time the land should be in market before it be surrendered,) that is, about four acres to each individual in the State, while the public lands in the State of Ohio have brought into the Treasury about seventeen millions of dollars, besides satisfying, to a large amount, the debts of the Government.

Missouri, upon a like mode of distribution or surrender, would have not less than twenty-five millions of acres, or about one hundred and sixty acres to each individual, black and white, according to the census of 1830. Thus, one inhabitant of Missouri would receive a quantity of land equal to what would be received by forty inhabitants of Ohio; and, while the lands in Ohio have brought seventeen millions into the public Treasury, the lands in Missouri have brought in less than three millions. This disparity, therefore, would be very unjust to Ohio, but still more so to the other States of the Union having equal rights, and which, on this principle of surrender, would receive nothing. It cannot, therefore, be expected by any one, however strongly solicitous he may feel for the advancement of the new States, that such a measure will be adopted. Something more equal and more just must be thought of by those who wish to promote their interests and add to their prosperity.

There are other measures proposed which, if adopted, would affect, more or less, the interest of the United States in the public land, by lessening its general value and rendering its management more complicated and difficult. One of the first, and not the least important of these, is the law granting pre-emptions to actual settlers, which was first passed on the 29th day of May, 1830, and which, with some modifications, is still in force. The intent of this law was that of kindness and benevolence. It was enacted for the benefit of the poorer class of citizens, who, having pushed forward beyond the lands offered for sale, settled and improved the public lands, and made themselves a home, with some comforts around them, and had become able, by their industry, to pay for these lands at the minimum price. It seemed hard that these pioneers, who, had thus improved the lands by their labor, should be compelled to enter into competition with new adventurers at the sales, and thus pay for improvements which they themselves had made. Such appear to have been the reasons for the enactment of these laws. They provided that, when two individuals cultivated one quarter section of land, each should be entitled to the pre-emption of half the tract so jointly cultivated, and each, also, to a pre-emption of eighty acres any where in the same land district; and, by a supplementary law, the claims were made assignable.

Your committee have satisfactory information that these laws have been

the cause of frauds and perjuries, to an amount and number almost incredible. Thousands of pre-emption have been proved under them, and certificates granted, when the whole case was without the least shadow of foundation. In other cases, the cutting down of a single tree, the marking it with a hatchet, or encamping for the night, has been made the ground of pre-emption claims. In most of the last-named cases, two individuals would together cut down their sapling, or tie each his horse upon the same quarter section of land: this, with the oath founded upon it, which appears to be always according to form, would get for each of the individuals a certificate or warrant, now familiarly called "*a float*," which they might lay on any of the lands of the United States which was surveyed, and not offered for sale; thus taking, at the minimum price of \$1 25 per acre, lands worth, in many instances, more than twenty times that sum. Large companies, it is believed, have been formed, who procure affidavits of improvements to be made, get the warrants issued upon them, and whenever a good tract of land is ready for sale, cover it over with their *floats*, and thus put down competition. The frauds upon the public within the past year, from this single source, have arisen to many millions of dollars.

Your committee believe that a great error was committed by the passage of these laws, and that no amendment or modification will guard against the mischiefs which they have heretofore produced. Claims of this kind cannot, in the very nature of things, be subjected to judicial investigation; or, if they were, the means of eliciting truth, the confronting of witness against witness by parties, who are stimulated on both sides to the uttermost to rebut and repel, cannot be brought to bear upon the examination of these claims. Hence a few individuals, whose evidence can be purchased with a price, and who can appear under different names at pleasure, may, under the auspices of these laws, divert millions of money from the public treasury into the coffers of their employers.

The system early adopted for the disposition of the public lands of the United States is admirable, and, in the opinion of your committee, ought not to be broken in upon or departed from. The pre-emption laws have, more than any other cause, tended to unsettle and derange them, and they have thrown upon the General Land Office a mass of labor, most unpleasant in its character, and difficult to be performed. The good which they do bears no comparison to the evil, for every dollar which the poorer settlers save by them, hundreds are lost by the Government, and fraud, and perjury, and unlawful combination and lawless violence, to put down competition at public sales, have arisen out of their provisions. In the opinion of your committee, they ought to cease.

There are also connected in some measure with this subject, several bills and memorials referred to your committee, proposing or praying for grants of land for seminaries of learning, for public education, or to aid in constructing works of internal improvement. These are all meritorious objects, and your committee are disposed to give them the most favorable consideration. But there are many difficulties attending the action of Congress on these special subjects. The very great extent of our country, the general feeling that all parts of it have equal rights to the munificence of Congress, the impossibility of determining which, among many institutions in the same State, ought to have such bounty as Congress

might be disposed to bestow on objects of this kind, all lead to the conclusion that it were better to put it in the power of the several States to confer these bounties, and select the most worthy objects, than to attempt here to perform that office.

The rapidity with which the public lands now sell, the ease with which they are converted into money, the abundance of money now in the treasury, and the moral certainty that there will be, for a long time, enough, and more than enough, to meet the current expenses of the Government, have impressed strongly upon your committee the opinion, that it is impolitic and inexpedient to make a donation of *land* for any *object*, where a donation of money may be as lawfully made, and will effect the same end. These donations or transfers of land are liable to the objection that they tend more or less to confuse and complicate the land system. They all add something to the duties of the officers of the United States who have charge of the public lands, and they serve to embarrass the purchaser, who has not, as he would without them have, one set, and one only, of land offices to whom he is to resort for the entry of lands. There is another objection. Though it be the fact that a donation of land by law is equivalent to a donation of money, yet we do not always feel it exactly so. There is a natural tendency to consider it more highly than it deserves, and to treat it too highly in legislation.

Your committee, on the whole, believe that it is better, if Congress have the constitutional power, to distribute among the several States, according to their respective rights, the proceeds of the sales of the public lands, allowing the States to use it for any or all of the purposes set forth and recommended in these bills and memorials. But that the lands themselves should not be assigned over, given away, or granted by Congress; that the ancient system of sales should be carefully preserved, and that all the deviations from it, which have caused much waste and confusion, should, as soon as possible, be corrected, and the former order of things fully restored.

The question of constitutional power has occupied the careful and sedulous attention of the committee; and they here present to the Senate the course of reasoning on that subject which they consider sound and just, and which has led them to the conclusion that Congress possesses the power to distribute the proceeds of the public lands according to the principles of this bill.

At the time the deed of cession from Virginia was made and accepted, the Union was held together by the articles of confederation of 1778, which, in its 8th article, provides "that all charges of war and other expenses that shall be incurred for the common defence, or general welfare, and allowed by the United States in Congress assembled, shall be defrayed out of a common treasury, which shall be supplied by the several States."

The mode of determining the proportion which each of the States shall bear of the public charges, is particularly pointed out, and it is there provided that "the taxes for paying that proportion shall be laid and levied by the authority and direction of the several States." To this state of things, existing at the time of the delivery of the Virginia deed of cession, its provisions must necessarily apply. It was to a confederacy of independent States, who kept up a common treasury out of contribu-

tions from each of its several members, according to a determinate regulation, that this deed was made, and after making certain reservations, specially set forth, it declares the trust in the following distinct and unequivocal terms: "That all the lands within the territory so ceded to the United States, and not reserved for or appropriated to any of the before-mentioned purposes, or disposed of in bounties to the officers and soldiers of the American army, shall be considered as a common fund for the use and benefit of such of the United States as have become, or shall become, members of the confederation, Virginia inclusive, according to their usual respective proportions in the general charge and expenditures, and shall be faithfully and bona fide disposed of for that purpose, and for no other use or purpose whatsoever." If, then, we had still continued, down to the present time, a confederation of States, bound together by the articles of 1778, and if, as is now the case, the public debt were discharged, the public expenses borne by revenues from other quarters, and the public land pouring its millions into the treasury, what ought Congress, as the trustee of that common fund, to do with it? It is a trust fund, placed in the hands of Congress "*for the use and benefit of the several States,*" and it is to be disposed of "*bona fide*" for that purpose, "*and for no other use or purpose whatsoever.*" So long as there was a public debt to be paid, this fund was well applied for the common benefit in the payment of that debt, as the debt was a common charge upon all, "according to their usual respective proportions in the public expenditures." And so long as it was necessary for the support of Government, its application to that purpose was right, for the same reason, but when this state of things has ceased, when the proceeds of the public lands are no longer necessary for either of these purposes, what is it the *duty of the trustee* to do with it, according to the letter and spirit of the deed of trust? And what, were it a case between individuals, would a court of equity compel him to do? The answer is plain and obvious. He not only *might pay it*, but he would be *bound* to pay it over to those for whose benefit he held it. If it were not necessary to disburse it *for them*, he must restore it *to them*. This, as between individuals, would be a plain case, and your committee cannot perceive how it is varied when applied between States and nations. If, then, we had remained, as we were, members of the old confederation; if the constitution had not intervened, to change, in anywise, the relations of the States to each other, or to the whole, it would have been not only the *right*, but the duty of Congress, pursuant to the spirit of that deed of cession, to have distributed among the several States the proceeds of the sales of the lands contained within the bounds of that grant. The delivery and acceptance of this deed amounted to a *contract*, and the above is, according to the opinion of your committee, the just construction of that contract.

But the rights and duties of the United States as a contracting party, are not at all changed by the adoption of the constitution. The 1st section of the 6th article of that instrument provides "that all debts contracted, and engagements entered into, before the adoption of this constitution, shall be as valid against the United States under this constitution as under the confederation;" so that our rights, and our duties, with regard to this trust, are the same precisely that they would have

been under the old confederation. All that has been said relative to the deed of cession from Virginia, applies equally to the cessions from the other States, except Georgia, whose deed bears date after the adoption of the Federal constitution; but, with this exception, it is in tenor and spirit the same with the deed above considered.

Your committee are hence led to the conclusion, that with respect to the proceeds of all the lands north of the 31st degree of latitude, and east of the Mississippi river, Congress not only has the constitutional power to make the proposed distribution, but it is a duty enjoined on them by a contract which is recognised and adopted by the constitution.

As to the land lying within the bounds of the original purchase of Louisiana and Florida, our right so to apply it rests upon less satisfactory grounds. We have no compact concerning it; no constitutional provision, or any agreement recognised by the constitution, which expressly authorized the *purchase* of this additional territory, or which places the land so purchased in the same situation with that which was originally transferred to Congress by the States. But the right to acquire the additional territory is no longer an open question. It has been settled, and by virtue of its adjustment, we have already received into the Union two States, and the prosperity of the whole country has been thereby greatly enhanced. It would seem, that when a large extent of territory was added to that which heretofore belonged to the United States, it ought to be subjected to the same constitutional and legal principles which governed in the disposition and management of the lands which we held at the time of the formation of the constitution. It has been so, strictly, in all things, so far as it related to jurisdiction: it would seem just and reasonable that it should be so as to soil also.

But, in every estimate which has been as yet presented of the costs and the proceeds of the public lands, whether by the Secretary of the Treasury or by committees of Congress, the money paid for Louisiana and Florida has been charged to this fund, and it continues to be so down to the last report of the Secretary of the Treasury, of the 8th of December, 1835. If this be correct, if the public lands have been made the fund out of which this large purchase has been paid, it is in truth but a conversion of the receipts for land into other lands, which would, as a necessary consequence, follow the same law of distribution which applied to the original subject out of which the payments were made. The fact that other great and important advantages were derived to the Union from the purchase of these two territories, does not at all weaken the force of the argument, but leaves it, in this particular instance, precisely as it would have stood if there had been a purchase of land merely out of the funds arising from the sales of lands; and by the well-known principles of equity, the trust attends the fund, whensoever invested.

Your committee have not taken into consideration the question whether Congress have power, under the constitution, to distribute a portion of the general revenue among the several States, but have chosen to rest the measure proposed by this bill on its own special grounds.

The expediency of this measure appears from considerations heretofore suggested, nor those alone. The distribution of the proceeds of the public lands among the several States would cause a watchful censorship over this branch of the public revenues, which has fallen into confusion by past

negligence and inattention. The representatives in Congress from the several States would be induced, by the interest which their immediate constituents must feel in the subject, to prevent the waste of the public lands, as well as of public money, and to watch over the national domain, as a matter in which those to whom they are responsible have a direct and immediate interest.

It would withdraw from the treasury of the United States the surplus revenue, without infringing on the constitution, or touching any of its provisions. The money so withdrawn will be, in effect, restored to the pockets of the people, as it will thus enable the several States to exempt their citizens from a direct and burdensome taxation, which they now of necessity impose to effect those public improvements which the situation of the whole country demands, and which are requisite to the prosperity and advancement of each particular State. So long as the law may be continued in force, it will be a steady, regular, and certain resource for these and like purposes to the several States, nor ought they, or will they feel that it is a gift gratuitously given and submissively received. If our views of the subject be just, it is, in the present state of the treasury, their own as a matter of equity, not of mere favor; and State pride would not be humbled, or State independence endangered, by receiving it.

By a provision of the constitution of the United States, the several States are denied the right of laying imposts upon commerce—that easy and indirect mode of raising a revenue which is hardly felt by a people. They are, therefore, generally compelled to resort to direct taxes upon land and goods, and, in the Western States, on land especially, to provide for the wants of Government, and to construct such works of internal improvement as their wants and welfare may require; and in some of the States, those taxes have borne heavily upon the people. That burden, by the distribution proposed by this bill, would be lightened, and a large annual fund placed in the hands of the several States, which would enable them to extend the benefit of their improvements as fast and as far as the general interests might require.

Your committee entertain no doubt that if our country continues in a state of peace, and if no unforeseen calamity should visit it and mar its prosperity, that the receipts from customs brought down to the lowest standard that existing laws contemplate, will still be amply sufficient for all the current expenses of the Government, economically administered. The estimates which are sent us from the Secretary of the Treasury of those probable receipts, have not for some time past approached very nearly to accuracy; they, therefore, cannot be received as the basis of an estimate.

The increased population and business of the country, the very force of circumstances, which none can control, pours into the Treasury millions upon millions, which its officers were not led to anticipate, and which they hardly seem yet to realize. In the report of the Secretary of the Treasury of the 8th of December, 1835, he estimates the revenue of the last quarter of that year at \$4,950,000. But, in answer to a resolution of the Senate of the 5th of the present month, he shows that the actual receipts for the same quarter have in fact amounted to about \$11,149,000, exceeding the amount of the estimate by about \$6,200,000.

while the whole receipts of the year 1835 have exceeded his estimate by about \$14,629,000.

Having formed the opinion that it is within the constitutional power of Congress to pass this measure ; that the finances of the nation will not be too much diminished, or at all deranged by it ; and that the general prosperity of the country would be increased by its adoption, your committee have thought it within the range of their duty to estimate, as nearly as may be from the data within their power, the probable annual amount which will arise from the sales of the public lands, and be subject to distribution, should this bill become a law.

In looking into the future of human affairs, and judging of them from the past, we are constantly liable to error, arising from the difficulty of estimating all the disturbing causes which may intervene to produce a fluctuation in the course and current of events. On this subject, however, there are more stable and constant elements, which go to make up the data of our calculations than generally enter into financial estimates.

The sales of the public lands rest essentially on the wants of the husbandman, and are limited to a quantity little exceeding those wants. It is true, when the price is much below its actual value, it may become a subject of extensive speculation, but even then the amount of sales resolves itself into the same element, and speculation merely goes in advance of the farmer, who purchases for actual occupation, without increasing the aggregate of sales in a series of years. The principles of population which have developed themselves in the United States in the last forty years, will not, probably, change materially in a like period to come, for, within that time, none of those causes which operate as checks upon population can, in the ordinary course of things, have existence here ; nor is it probable that the pursuits of the great body of the people will essentially change ; for the same causes which have made us an agricultural community are likely to continue without diminution, so long as the means of subsistence remain, as now, abundant and easy to be procured ; and so long as there is a wide public domain parcelled out and ready for sale on moderate terms, placing a home and a freehold in the power of all that have the wish to possess them. The population of our country is, therefore, likely to continue its ratio of increase, and the habits and pursuits of our people to remain the same. Hence the investments in land for the use of the agriculturalists will increase in like ratio as heretofore with the increase of our population.

Prior to the year 1800, but little land had been sold by the United States, and there was at that time of wild and uncultivated land within the bounds of the now States of Maine, Vermont, New York, Pennsylvania, Virginia, Georgia, Tennessee, Kentucky, and Ohio, belonging to the States and individuals, a very large quantity, the amount of which cannot be very accurately ascertained, but it is safe to say that it exceeded one hundred millions of acres. This has all, or nearly all, since passed into the hands of actual settlers ; and there has been sold and granted of the lands of the United States within that period about fifty millions of acres. Thus it appears there have been taken up and converted to the use of the husbandman, within the last thirty-five years, about one hundred and fifty millions of acres of wild land ; and in the mean time little or none heretofore cultivated has been abandoned. The population of the United States in 1800 was four millions, nearly ; at

this time it is about fourteen million five hundred thousand ; and as the increase upon four millions has, in thirty-five years, required one hundred and fifty million acres of new land, it follows that a like increase upon fourteen million five hundred thousand will, in a like period, require about five hundred and forty millions of acres, rising from the beginning to the end of the period in a ratio of progression ; the average amount being about fifteen millions per year.

From the above data, your committee estimate the average receipts from the sales of the public lands for the next ten years, if the country continue in peace, if the land system be faithfully preserved, and if the sales be guarded from combination and fraud, at an average of something more than \$10,000,000 per annum. There is already in hand, to be divided by the terms of this bill, \$20,571,125 75 ; of this, the several States will be entitled to receive the sums shown by the annexed table, and of the receipts of each succeeding year, until the next census, in nearly the same proportions.

Your committee report the bill back with amendments, and recommend its passage.

Table showing the amount to which each State will be entitled.

	Federal population.	Share for each State.	Fifteen per cent. to new States.	Total to new States.
Maine, -	399,437	689,028		
New Hampshire, -	269,326	464,587		
Massachusetts, -	610,408	1,052,953		
Rhode Island, -	97,194	167,659		
Connecticut, -	297,665	513,472		
Vermont, -	280,657	484,133		
New York, -	1,918,553	3,309,503		
New Jersey, -	319,922	551,865		
Pennsylvania, -	1,348,072	2,325,424		
Delaware, -	75,432	130,120		
Maryland, -	405,843	700,079		
Virginia, -	1,023,503	1,765,554		
North Carolina, -	639,747	1,103,563		
South Carolina, -	455,025	784,918		
Georgia, -	429,811	741,423		
Kentucky, -	621,832	1,072,660		
Tennessee, -	625,263	1,078,578		
Ohio, -	935,884	1,614,400	230,844	1,845,244
Louisiana, -	171,694	296,172	67,561	363,733
Indiana, -	343,031	591,728	325,485	917,213
Illinois, -	157,147	271,078	483,760	754,838
Missouri, -	130,419	224,972	174,354	399,326
Mississippi, -	110,358	190,367	788,403	978,770
Alabama, -	262,508	452,826	541,940	994,766

APRIL 16, 1832.

Mr. CLAY, from the Committee on Manufactures, made, to the Senate, the following report :

The Committee on Manufactures have been instructed by the Senate to inquire into the expediency of reducing the price of public lands, and of ceding them to the several States within which they are situated, on reasonable terms. Far from desiring to assume the duty involved in this important inquiry, it is known to the Senate that a majority of the committee was desirous that the subject should have been referred to some other committee. But, as the Senate took a different view of the matter, the Committee on Manufactures have felt bound to acquiesce in its decisions ; and, having bestowed on the whole subject the best consideration in their power, now beg leave to submit to the Senate the result of their inquiries and reflections.

The public lands belonging to the General Government are situated, 1st, within the limits of the United States as defined by the treaty of peace which terminated the revolutionary war ; and, 2dly, within the boundaries of Louisiana and Florida as ceded by France and Spain, respectively, to the United States.

1st. At the commencement of the revolutionary war, there were, in some of the States, large bodies of waste and unappropriated lands, principally west of the Allegany mountains, and in the southern or southwestern quarters of the Union, whilst in others, of more circumscribed or better defined limits, no such resource existed. During the progress of that war, the question was agitated, What should be done with these lands in the event of its successful termination ? That question was likely to lead to paralyzing divisions and jealousies. The States not containing any considerable quantity of waste lands contended that, as the war was waged with united means, with equal sacrifices, and at the common expense, the waste lands ought to be considered as a common property, and not be exclusively appropriated to the benefit of the particular States within which they happened to be situated. These, however, resisted the claim, upon the ground that each State was entitled to the whole of the territory, whether waste or cultivated, included within its chartered limits. To check the progress of discontent, and arrest the serious consequences to which the agitation of this question might lead, Congress recommended to the States to make liberal cessions of the waste and unseated lands to the United States ; and, on the 10th day of October, 1780, "*Resolved*, That the unappropriated lands that may be ceded or relinquished to the United States, by any particular State, pursuant to the recommendation of Congress of the 6th of September last, shall be disposed of *for the common benefit* of the United States," &c.

In conformity with the recommendation of Congress, the several States containing waste and uncultivated lands made cessions of them to the United States. The declared object having been substantially the same in all of these cessions, it is only necessary to advert to the terms of some of them. The first, in order of time, was that of New York, made on the first day of March, 1781, by its delegation in Congress, in pursuance of an act of the Legislature of the State ; and the terms of the deed of ces-

sion expressly provide that the ceded lands and territories were to be held, "to and for the *only use and benefit* of such of the States as are, or shall become, parties to the articles of confederation." That of Virginia was the next in date, but, by far the most important of all the cessions made by the different States, both as respects the extent and value of the country ceded. It comprehended the right of that commonwealth to the vast territory northwest of the river Ohio, embracing, but not confined to the limits of, the present States of Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois. The deed of cession was executed by the delegation of Virginia in Congress, in 1784, agreeably to an act of the Legislature passed in 1783; and, among other conditions, the deed explicitly declares "that all the lands within the territory so ceded to the United States, and not reserved for, or appropriated to, any of the before-mentioned purposes, or disposed of in bounties to the officers and soldiers of the American army, shall be considered *a common fund for the use and benefit of such of the United States as have become, or shall become, members of the confederation or federal alliance of the said States, Virginia inclusive*, according to their usual respective proportions in the general charge and expenditure, and shall be *faithfully and bona fide* disposed of for that *purpose*, and for no other use or purpose whatsoever." Passing by the cessions which other States, prompted by a magnanimous spirit of union and patriotism, successively made, we come to the last in the series, that of the State of Georgia, in 1802. The articles of agreement and cession entered into between that State and the United States, among various other conditions, contain the unequivocal declaration, "that all the lands ceded by this agreement to the United States shall, after satisfying the above-mentioned payment of one million two hundred and fifty thousand dollars to the State of Georgia, and the grants recognised by the preceding conditions, be considered *as a common fund for the use and benefit of the United States, Georgia included, and shall be faithfully disposed of for that purpose, and for no other use or purpose whatever.*"

Thus, by the clear and positive terms of these acts of cession, was a great, public, national trust created and assumed by the General Government. It became solemnly bound to hold and administer the lands ceded, as a common fund for the *use and benefit* of all the States, and for no *other* use or purpose whatever. To waste or misapply this fund, or to divert it from the common benefit for which it was conveyed, would be a violation of the trust. The General Government has no more power, rightfully, to cede the lands thus acquired to one of the new States, without a fair equivalent, than it could retrocede them to the State or States from which they were originally obtained. There would indeed be much more equity in the latter than in the former case. Nor is the moral responsibility of the General Government at all weakened by the consideration that, if it were so unmindful of its duty as to disregard the sacred character of the trust, there might be no competent power, peacefully applied, which could coerce its faithful execution.

2d. The other source whence the public lands of the United States have been acquired, are, 1st, the treaty of Louisiana, concluded in 1803; and, secondly, the treaty of Florida, signed in 1819. By the first, all the country west of the Mississippi, and extending to the Pacific ocean, known as Louisiana, which had successively belonged to France, Spain,

and France again, including the island of New Orleans, and stretching east of the Mississippi to the Perdido, was transferred to the United States, in consideration of the sum of fifteen millions of dollars which they stipulated to pay, and have since punctually paid, to France, besides other conditions deemed favorable and important to her interests. By the treaty of Florida, both the provinces of East and West Florida, whether any portion of them was or was not actually comprehended within the true limits of Louisiana, were ceded to the United States, in consideration, besides other things, of the payment of five millions of dollars, which they agreed to pay, and have since accordingly paid.

The large pecuniary considerations thus paid to these two foreign Powers were drawn from the treasury of the people of the United States; and, consequently, the countries for which they formed the equivalents ought to be held and deemed for the common benefit of all the people of the United States. To divert the lands from that general object; to misapply or sacrifice them; to squander or improvidently cast them away, would be alike subversive of the interests of the people of the United States, and contrary to the plain dictates of the duty by which the General Government stands bound to the States and to the whole people.

Prior to the treaties of Louisiana and Florida, Congress had adopted a system for surveying and selling the public lands, devised with much care and great deliberation, the advantages of which having been fully tested by experience, it was subsequently applied to the countries acquired by those treaties. According to that system, all public lands offered for sale are previously accurately surveyed, by skilful surveyors, in ranges of townships of six miles square each, which townships are subdivided into thirty-six equal divisions or square miles, called sections, by lines crossing each other at right angles, and generally containing 640 acres. These sections are again divided into quarters, and prior to the year 1820, no person could purchase a less quantity than a quarter. In that year, provision was made for the further division of the sections into eighths, thereby allowing a purchaser to buy only eighty acres, if he wished to purchase no more. During the present session of Congress, further to extend accommodation to purchasers of the public lands, and especially to the poorer classes, the sections have been again divided into sixteenths, admitting a purchase of only forty acres.

This uniform system of surveying and dividing the public lands applies to all the States and Territories within which they are situated. Its great advantages are manifest. It ensures perfect security of title and certainty of boundary, and consequently avoids those perplexing land disputes, the worst of all species of litigation, the distressing effects of which have been fatally experienced in some of the Western States. But these are not the only advantages, great as they unquestionably are. The system lays the foundation of useful civil institutions, the benefit of which is not confined to the present generation, but will be transmitted to posterity.

Under the operation of the system thus briefly sketched, the progress of the settlement and population of the public domain of the United States has been altogether unexampled. Views which the committee will hereafter present, conclusively demonstrate that, whilst the spirit of free emigration should not be checked or counteracted, it stands in no need of any fresh stimulus.

Before proceeding to perform the specific duty assigned to the committee by the Senate, they had thought it desirable to exhibit some general views of this great national resource. For that purpose, a call, through the Senate, for information, has been made upon the Executive branch of the Government. A report has not yet been made; but, as the committee are desirous of avoiding any delay, not altogether indispensable, they have availed themselves of the report from a Secretary of the Treasury to the House of Representatives, under date the 6th April, 1832, hereto annexed, marked A, and of such other information as was accessible to them.

From that report, it appears that the aggregate of all sums of money which have been expended by the United States in the acquisition of the public lands, including interest on account of the purchases of Louisiana and Florida up to the 30th day of September, 1831, and including also expenses in their sale and management, is \$48,077,551 40; and that the amount of money received at the Treasury for proceeds of the sales of the public lands to the 30th of September, 1831, is \$37,272,713 31. The Government, therefore, has not been reimbursed by \$10,804,838 90. According to the same report, it appears that the estimated amount of unsold lands, on which the foreign and Indian titles have been extinguished is 227,293,884, within the limits of the new States and Territories; and that the Indian title remains on 113,577,869 acres within the same limits. That there have been granted to Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and Alabama, for internal improvements, 2,187,665 acres; for colleges, academies, and universities in the new States and Territories, the quantity of 508,009; for education, being the thirty-sixth part of the public lands appropriated for common schools, the amount of 7,952,538 acres; and for seats of Government in some of the new States and Territories, 21,589 acres. By a report of the Commissioner of the General Land Office, communicated to Congress with the annual message of the President of the United States in December, 1827, the total quantity of the public lands, beyond the boundaries of the new States and Territories, was estimated to be 750,000,000. The aggregate, therefore, of all the unsold and unappropriated public lands of the United States, surveyed and unsurveyed, on which the Indian title remains or has been extinguished, lying within and without the boundaries of the new States and Territories, agreeably to the two reports now referred to, is 1,090,871,753 acres. There had been 138,988,224 acres surveyed, and the quantity only of 19,239,412 acres sold up to the 1st January, 1826. When the information called for shall be received, the subsequent surveys and sales up to the present period will be ascertained.

The committee are instructed by the Senate to inquire into the expediency of reducing the price of the public lands, and also of ceding them to the several States in which they are situated, on reasonable terms. The committee will proceed to examine these two subjects of inquiry distinctly, beginning first with that which relates to a reduction of price.

1. According to the existing mode of selling the public lands they are first offered at public auction for what they will bring in a free and fair competition among the purchasers; when the public sales cease, the lands remaining unsold may be bought, from time to time, at the established rate of one dollar and a quarter per acre. The price was reduced to

that sum in 1820, from \$2 per acre, at which it had previously stood from the first establishment of the present system of selling public lands. A leading consideration with Congress in the reduction of the price, was that of substituting cash sales for the credits which had been before allowed, and which, on many accounts, it was deemed expedient to abolish. A further reduction of the price, if called for by the public interests, must be required, either, 1st, Because the Government now demands more than a fair price for the public lands; or, 2dly, Because the existing price retards, injuriously, the settlement and population of the new States and Territories. These suggestions deserve separate and serious considerations.

I. The committee possess no means of determining the exact value of all the public lands now in market; nor is it material, at the present time, that the precise worth of each township or section should be accurately known. It is presumable that a considerable portion of the immense quantity offered to sale, or held by the United States, would not now command, and may not be intrinsically worth the minimum price fixed by law; on the other hand, it is certain that a large part is worth more. If there could be a discrimination made, and the Government had any motive to hasten the sales beyond the regular demands of the population, it might be proper to establish different rates, according to the classes of land; but the Government, having no inducement to such acceleration, has hitherto proceeded on the liberal policy of establishing a moderate price, and by subdivisions of the sections, so as to accommodate the poorer citizens, has placed the acquisition of a home within the reach of every industrious man. For \$100 any one may now purchase eighty, or for \$50, forty acres of first-rate land, yielding, with proper cultivation, from fifty to eighty bushels of Indian corn per acre, or other equivalent crops.

There is no more satisfactory criterion of the fairness of the price of an article than that arising from the briskness of sales when it is offered in the market. On applying this rule, the conclusion would seem to be irresistible, that the established price is not too high. The amount of the sales in the year 1828, was \$1,018,308 75; in 1829, \$1,517,175 13; in 1830, \$2,329,356 14; and, during the year 1831, \$3,000,000. And the Secretary of the Treasury observes in his annual report, at the commencement of this session, that "the receipts from the public lands, during the present year, it will be perceived, have likewise exceeded the estimates, and indeed *have gone beyond all former example*. It is believed that, notwithstanding the large amount of scrip and forfeited land stock that may still be absorbed in payment for lands, yet if the surveys now projected be completed, the receipts from this source of revenue will not fall greatly below those of the present year." And he estimates the receipts during the current year, from this source, at three millions of dollars. It is incredible to suppose that the amount of sales would have risen to so large a sum if the price had been unreasonably high. The committee are aware that the annual receipts may be expected to fluctuate, as fresh lands, in favorite districts, are brought into market, and according to the activity or sluggishness of emigration in different years.

Against any considerable reduction of the price of the public lands, unless it be necessary to a more rapid population of the new States, which

will be hereafter examined, there are weighty, if not decisive considerations.

1. The Government is the proprietor of much the largest quantity of the unseated lands of the United States. What it has in market bears a large proportion to the whole of the occupied lands within their limits. If a considerable quantity of any article, land, or any commodity whatever, is in market, the price at which it is sold will affect, in some degree, the value of the whole of that article, whether exposed to sale or not. The influence of a reduction of the price of the public lands would probably be felt throughout the Union; certainly in all the Western States, and most in those which contain, or are nearest to, the public lands. There ought to be the most cogent and conclusive reasons for adopting a measure which might seriously impair the value of the property of the yeomanry of the country. Whilst it is decidedly the most important class in the community, most patient, patriotic, and acquiescent in whatever public policy is pursued, it is unable or unwilling to resort to those means of union and concert which other interest employ to make themselves heard and respected. Government should, therefore, feel itself constantly bound to guard, with sedulous care, the rights and welfare of the great body of our yeomanry. Would it be just towards those who have heretofore purchased public lands at higher prices, to say nothing as to the residue of the agricultural interest of the United States, to make such a reduction, and thereby impair the value of their property? Ought not any such plan of reduction, if adopted, to be accompanied with compensation for the injury which they would inevitably sustain?

2. A material reduction of price would excite and stimulate the spirit of speculation, now dormant, and probably lead to a transfer of vast quantities of the public domain from the control of Government to the hands of the speculator. At the existing price, and with such extensive districts as the public constantly offers in the market, there is no great temptation to speculation. The demand is regular, keeping pace with the progress of emigration, and is supplied on known and moderate terms. If the price were much reduced, the strongest incentives to engrossment of the better lands would be presented to large capitalists; and the emigrant, instead of being able to purchase from his own Government upon uniform and established conditions, might be compelled to give much higher and more fluctuating prices to the speculator. An illustration of this effect is afforded by the military bounty lands granted during the late war. Thrown into market at prices below the Government rate, they notoriously became an object of speculation, and have principally fallen into the hands of speculators, retarding the settlement of the districts which include them.

3. The greatest emigration that is believed now to take place from any of the States, is from Ohio, Kentucky, and Tennessee. The effects of a material reduction in the price of the public lands would be, 1st, To lessen the value of real estate in those three States. 2d, To diminish their interest in the public domain, as a common fund for the benefit of all the States. And, 3dly, To offer what would operate as a bounty to further emigration from those States, occasioning more and more lands situated within them to be thrown into the market, thereby not only lessening the value of their lands, but draining them both of their population and currency.

And, lastly, Congress has, within a few years, made large and liberal grants of the public lands to several States. To Ohio, 922,937 acres; to Indiana, 384,728 acres; to Illinois, 480,000 acres; and to Alabama, 400,000 acres; amounting together to 2,187,665 acres. Considerable portions of these land yet remain unsold. The reduction of the price of the public lands, generally, would impair the value of those grants, as well as injuriously affect that of the lands which have been sold in virtue of them.

On the other hand, it is inferred and contended, from the large amount of public land remaining unsold, after having been so long exposed to sale, that the price at which it is held is too high. But this apparent tardiness is satisfactorily explained by the immense quantity of public lands which have been put into the market by Government. It is well known that the new States have constantly and urgently pressed the extinction of the Indian title upon lands within their respective limits, and, after its extinction, that they should be brought into market as rapidly as practicable. The liberal policy of the General Government, coinciding with the wishes of the new States, has prompted it to satisfy the wants of emigrants from every part of the Union, by exhibiting vast districts of land for sale in all the States and Territories, thus offering every variety of climate and situation to the free choice of settlers. From these causes, it has resulted that the power of emigration has been totally incompetent to absorb the immense bodies of waste lands offered in the market. For the capacity to purchase is, after all, limited by the emigration, and the progressive increase of population. If the quantity thrown into the market had been quadrupled, the probability is that there would not have been much more annually sold than actually has been. With such extensive fields for selection before them, purchasers, embarrassed as to the choice which they should make, are sometimes probably influenced by caprice or accidental causes. Whilst the better lands remain, those of secondary value will not be purchased. A judicious farmer or planter would sooner give one dollar and a quarter per acre for first-rate land, than receive as donation land of inferior quality, if he were compelled to settle upon it.

It is also contended that the price of the public land is a tax; and that at a period when, in consequence of the payment of the public debt and the financial prosperity of the United States, the Government is enabled to dispense with revenue, that tax ought to be reduced, and the revenue arising from the sales be thereby diminished. In the first place, it is to be observed that if, as has been before stated, the reduction of the price of the public lands should stimulate speculation, the consequence would probably be, at least for some years, an augmentation of the revenue from that source. Should it have the effect of speculation supposed, it would probably also retard the settlement of the new States, by placing the lands engrossed by speculators, in anticipation of increased value, beyond the reach of emigrants. If it were true that the price demanded by Government operated as a tax, the question would still remain whether that price exceeded the fair value of the land which emigrants are in the habit of purchasing? and, if it did not, there would be no just ground for its reduction. And assuming it to be a tax, it might be proper to inquire who pays the tax? the new or the old States—the States that send out or the States that receive the emigrants? In the next place, regarded

tax, those who have heretofore made purchases at the higher rate, have already paid the tax, and are as much deserving the equitable consideration of the Government as those who might hereafter be disposed to purchase at the reduced rate. It is proper to add that, by the repeal and reduction contemplated of duties upon articles of foreign import, subsequent purchasers of the public lands, as far as they are consumers of those article, will share in the general relief, and will consequently be enabled to apply more of their means to the purchase of land.

But in no reasonable sense can the sale of the public lands be considered as the imposition of a tax. The Government, in their disposal, acts as a trustee for the whole people of the United States, and, in that character, holds and offers them in the market. Those who want them, buy them, because it is their inclination to buy them. There is no compulsion in the case. The purchase is perfectly voluntary, like that of any other article which is offered in the market. In making it, the purchaser looks exclusively to his own interest. The motive of augmenting the public revenue, or any other motive than that of his own advantage, never enters into his consideration. The Government, therefore, stands to the purchaser in the relation merely of the vendor of a subject which the purchaser's own welfare prompts him to acquire; and, in this respect, does not vary from the relation which exists between any private vendor of waste lands, and the purchaser from him. Nor does the *use* to which the Government may think proper to apply the proceeds of the sale of the public lands give the smallest strength to the idea that the purchase of them is tantamount to the payment of a tax. The Government may employ those proceeds as a part of its ordinary revenue, or it may apply them in any other manner, consistent with the constitution, which it deems proper. Revenue and taxation are not always relative terms. There may be revenue without taxation. There may be taxation without revenue. There may be sources of established revenue which not only do not imply, but which supersede taxation. Is the consideration paid for land to a private individual to be deemed a tax, because that individual may happen to use it as a part of his income?

2. Is the reduction of the price of the public lands necessary to accelerate the settlement and population of the States within which they are situated? Those States are Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Missouri, Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana. If their growth has been unreasonably slow and tardy, we may conclude that some fresh impulse, such as that under consideration, is needed. Prior to the treaty of Greenville, concluded in 1795, there were but few settlements within the limits of the present State of Ohio. Principally since that period, that is, within a term of about forty years, that State, from a wilderness, the haunt of savages and wild beasts, has risen into a powerful commonwealth, containing, at this time, a population of a million of souls, and holding the third or fourth rank among the largest States in the Union. During the greater part of that term, the minimum price of the public lands was two dollars per acre; and of the large quantity with which the settlement of that State commenced, there only remain to be sold 5,586,834 acres.

The aggregate population of the United States, exclusive of the Territories, increased from the year 1820 to 1830, from 9,579,873 to 12,516,697. The rate of the increase, during the whole term of ten years,

including a fraction, may be stated at thirty-three per cent. The principle of population is presumed to have full scope generally in all parts of the United States. Any State, therefore, which has exceeded or fallen short of that rate, may be fairly assumed to have gained or lost by emigration nearly to the extent of the excess or deficiency. From a table accompanying this report, (marked B,) the Senate will see presented various interesting views of the progress of population in the several States. In that table, it will be seen that each of eleven States exceeded, and each of thirteen fell short of an increase at the average rate of thirty-three per cent. The greatest increase, during the term, was in the State of Illinois, where it was one hundred and eighty-five per cent., or at the rate of $18\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. per annum; and the least was in Delaware, where it was less than six per cent. The seven States embracing the public lands had a population, in 1820, of 1,207,165, and, in 1830, 2,238,802, exhibiting an average increase of 85 per cent. The seventeen States containing no part of the public lands had a population, in 1820, of 8,372,707, and, in 1830, of 10,477,895, presenting an average increase of only 25 per cent. The thirteen States, whose increase, according to the table, was below 33 per cent., contained, in 1820, a population of 5,939,759; and, in 1830, of 6,966,600, exhibiting an average increase of only seventeen per cent. The increase of the seven new States upon a capital which, at the commencement of the term, was 1,207,165, has been greater than that of the thirteen whose capital then was 5,939,759. In three of the eleven States, (Tennessee, Georgia, and Maine,) whose population exceeded the average increase of 33 per cent., there were public lands belonging to those States; and in the fourth, (New York,) the excess is probably attributable to the rapid growth of the city of New York, to waste lands in the western part of that State, and to the great development of its vast resources by means of extensive internal improvements.

These authentic views of the progress of population in the seven new States, demonstrate that it is most rapid and gratifying; that it needs no such additional stimulus as a farther reduction in the price of the public lands; and that, by preserving and persevering in the established system for selling them, the day is near at hand when those States, now respectable, may become great and powerful members of the confederacy.

Complaints exist in the new States, that large bodies of lands in their respective territories, being owned by the General Government, are exempt from taxation to meet the ordinary expenses of the State Governments, and other local charges; that this exemption continues for five years after the sale of any particular tract; and that land, being the principal source of the revenue of those States, an undue share of the burden of sustaining the expenses of the State Governments falls upon the resident population. To all these complaints it may be answered that, by voluntary compacts between the new States, respectively, and the General Government, five per cent. of the nett proceeds of all the sales of the public lands included within their limits are appropriated for internal improvements leading to or within those States; that a section of land in each township, or one thirty-sixth part of the whole of the public lands embraced within their respective boundaries, has been reserved for purposes of education; and that the policy of the General Government has

been uniformly marked by great liberality towards the new States, in making various, and some very extensive grants of the public lands for local purposes. But, in accordance with the same spirit of liberality, the committee would recommend an appropriation to each of the seven States referred to of a further sum of ten per cent. on the nett proceeds of the sales of that part of the public land which lies within it, for objects of internal improvement in their respective limits. The tendency of such an appropriation will be not only to benefit those States, but to enhance the value of the public lands remaining to be sold.

II. The committee have now to proceed to the other branch of the inquiry which they were required to make, that of the expediency of ceding the public lands to the several States in which they are situated, on reasonable terms. The inquiry comprehends, in its consequences, a cession of the whole public domain of the United States, whether lying within or beyond the limits of the present States and Territories. For, although in the terms of the inquiry, it is limited to the new States, cessions to them would certainly be followed by similar cessions to other new States, as they may, from time to time, be admitted into the Union. Three of the present Territories have nearly attained the requisite population entitling them to be received as members of the confederacy, and they shortly will be admitted. Congress could not consistently avoid ceding to them the public lands within their limits, after having made such cessions to the other States. The compact with the State of Ohio formed the model of compacts with all the other new States, as they were successively admitted.

Whether the question of a transfer of the public lands be considered in the limited, or more extensive view of it which has been stated, it is one of the highest importance, and demanding the most deliberate consideration. From the statements, founded on official reports, made in the preceding part of this report, it has been seen that the quantity of unsold and unappropriated lands lying within the limits of the new States and Territories, is 340,871,753 acres, and the quantity beyond those limits is 750,000,000, presenting an aggregate of 1,090,871,753 acres. It is difficult to conceive a question of greater magnitude than that of relinquishing this immense amount of national property. Estimating its value according to the minimum price, it presents the enormous sum of 1,363,589,691 dollars. If it be said that a large portion of it will never command that price, it is to be observed, on the other hand, that, as fresh lands are brought into market and exposed to sale at public auction, many of them sell at prices exceeding one dollar and a quarter per acre. Supposing the public lands to be worth, on the average, one-half of the minimum price, they would still present the immense sum of 681,794,845 dollars. The least favorable view which can be taken of them, is that of considering them a capital yielding, at present, an income of three millions of dollars annually. Assuming the ordinary rate of six per cent. interest per annum as the standard to ascertain the amount of that capital, it would be fifty millions of dollars. But this income has been progressively increasing. The average increase during the six last years has been at the rate of twenty-three per cent. per annum. Supposing it to continue in the same ratio, at the end of a little more than four years the income would be double, and make the capital 100,000,000 of dollars.

Whilst the population of the United States increase only three per cent. per annum, the increase of the demand for the public lands is at the rate of twenty-three per cent., furnishing another evidence that the progress of emigration, and the activity of sales, have not been checked by the price demanded by Government.

In whatever light, therefore, this great subject is viewed, the transfer of the public lands from the whole people of the United States, for whose benefit they are now held, to the people inhabiting the new States, must be regarded as the most momentous measure ever presented to the consideration of Congress. If such a measure could find any justification, it must arise out of some radical and incurable defect in the construction of the General Government properly to administer the public domain. But the existence of any such defect is contradicted by the most successful experience. No branch of the public service has evinced more system, uniformity, and wisdom, or given more general satisfaction, than that of the administration of the public lands.

If the proposed cession to the new States were to be made at a fair price, such as the General Government could obtain from individual purchasers under the present system, there would be no motive for it unless the new States are more competent to dispose of the public lands than the common Government. They are now sold under one uniform plan, regulated and controlled by a single legislative authority, and the practical operation is perfectly understood. If they were transferred to the new States, the subsequent disposition would be according to laws emanating from various legislative sources. Competition would probably arise between the new States in the terms which they would offer to purchasers. Each State would be desirous of inviting the greatest number of emigrants, not only for the laudable purpose of populating rapidly its own territories, but with the view to the acquisition of funds to enable it to fulfil its engagements to the General Government. Collisions between the States would probably arise, and their injurious consequences may be imagined. A spirit of hazardous speculation would be engendered. Various schemes in the new States would be put afloat to sell or divide the public lands. Companies and combinations would be formed in this country, if not in foreign countries, presenting gigantic and tempting, but delusive projects; and the history of legislation, in some of the States of the Union, admonishes us that a too ready ear is sometimes given by a majority, in a legislative assembly, to such projects.

A decisive objection to such a transfer for a fair equivalent, is, that it would establish a new and dangerous relation between the General Government and the new States. In abolishing the credit which had been allowed to purchasers of the public lands prior to the year 1820, Congress was principally governed by the consideration of the expediency and hazard of accumulating a large amount of debt in the new States, all bordering on each other. Such an accumulation was deemed unwise and unsafe. It presented a new bond of interest, of sympathy, and of union, partially operating to the possible prejudice of the common bond of the whole Union. But that debt was a debt due from individuals, and it was attended with this encouraging security, that purchasers, as they successively completed the payments for their lands, would naturally be disposed to aid the Government in enforcing payment from delin-

quents. The project which the committee are now considering, is, to sell to the States, in their sovereign character, and, consequently, to render them public debtors to the General Government to an immense amount. This would inevitably create between the debtor States a common feeling, and a common interest, distinct from the rest of the Union. These States are all in the Western and Southwestern quarter of the Union, remotest from the centre of Federal power. The debt would be felt as a load from which they would constantly be desirous to relieve themselves; and it would operate as a strong temptation, weakening, if not dangerous, to the existing confederacy. The committee have the most animating hopes and the greatest confidence in the strength and power and durability of our happy Union; and the attachment and warm affection of every member of the confederacy cannot be doubted: but we have authority, higher than human, for the instruction, that it is wise to avoid all temptation.

In the State of Illinois, with a population, at the last census, of 157,445, there are 31,395,669 acres of public land, including that part on which the Indian title remains to be extinguished. If we suppose it to be worth only half the minimum price, it would amount to \$19,622,480. How would that State be able to pay such an enormous debt? How could it pay even the annual interest upon it?

Supposing the debtor States to fail to comply with their engagements, in what mode could they be enforced by the General Government? In treaties between independent nations, the ultimate remedy is well known. The apprehension of an appeal to that remedy, seconding the sense of justice, and the regard for character which prevail among Christian and civilized nations, constitutes, generally, adequate security for the performance of national compacts. But this last remedy would be totally inadmissible in case of delinquency on the part of the debtor States. The relations between the General Government and the members of the confederacy, are happily those of peace, friendship, and fraternity, and exclude all idea of force and war. Could the judiciary coerce the debtor States? On what could their process operate? Could the property of innocent citizens, residing within the limits of those States, be justly seized by the General Government, and held responsible for debts contracted by the States themselves in their sovereign character? If a mortgage upon the lands ceded were retained, that mortgage would prevent or retard subsequent sales by the States; and if individuals bought, subject to the encumbrance, a parental Government could never resort to the painful measure of disturbing them in their possessions.

Delinquency on the part of the debtor States would be inevitable, and there would be no effectual remedy for the delinquency. They would come again and again to Congress, soliciting time and indulgence, until, finding the weight of the debt intolerable, Congress, wearied by reiterated applications for relief, would finally resolve to sponge the debt; or, if Congress attempted to enforce its payment, another and a worse alternative would be embraced.

If the proposed cession be made for a price merely nominal, it would be contrary to the express conditions of the original cessions from primitive States to Congress, and contrary to the obligations which the General Government stands under to the whole people of these United States,

arising out of the fact that the acquisitions of Louisiana and Florida, and from Georgia, were obtained at a great expense, borne from the common treasure, and incurred for the common benefit. Such a gratuitous cession could not be made without a positive violation of a solemn trust, and without manifest injustice to the old States. And its inequality among the new States would be as marked as its injustice to the old would be indefensible. Thus, Missouri, with a population of 140,455, would acquire 38,292,151 acres; and the State of Ohio, with a population of 935,884, would obtain only 5,536,834 acres. Supposing a division of the land among the citizens of those two States respectively, the citizen of Ohio would obtain less than six acres for his share, and the citizen of Missouri upwards of two hundred and seventy-two acres as his proportion.

Upon full and thorough consideration, the committee have come to the conclusion that it is inexpedient either to reduce the price of the public lands, or to cede them to the new States. They believe, on the contrary, that sound policy coincides with the duty which has devolved on the General Government to the whole of the States, and the whole of the people of the Union, and enjoins the preservation of the existing system as having been tried and approved after long and triumphant experience. But, in consequence of the extraordinary financial prosperity which the United States enjoy, the question merits examination, whether, whilst the General Government steadily retains the control of this great national resource in its own hands, after the payment of the public debt, the proceeds of the sales of the public lands, no longer needed to meet the ordinary expenses of Government, may not be beneficially appropriated to some other objects for a limited time?

Governments, no more than individuals, should be seduced or intoxicated by prosperity, however flattering or great it may be. The country now happily enjoys it in a most unexampled degree. We have abundant reason to be grateful for the blessings of peace and plenty, and freedom from debt. But we must be forgetful of all history and experience if we indulge the delusive hope that we shall always be exempt from calamity and reverses. Seasons of national adversity, of suffering, and of war, will assuredly come. A wise Government should expect, and provide for them. Instead of wasting or squandering its resources in a period of general prosperity, it should husband and cherish them for those times of trial and difficulty which, in the dispensations of Providence, may be certainly anticipated. Entertaining these views, and, as the proceeds of the sales of the public lands are not wanted for ordinary revenue, which will be abundantly supplied from the imposts, the committee respectfully recommend that an appropriation of them be made to some other purpose, for a limited time, subject to be resumed in the contingency of war. Should such an event unfortunately occur, the fund may be withdrawn from its peaceful destination, and applied in aid of other means, to the vigorous prosecution of the war, and, afterwards, to the payment of any debt which may be contracted in consequence of its existence. And, when peace shall be again restored, and the debt of the new war shall have been extinguished, the fund may be again appropriated to some fit object other than that of the ordinary expenses of Government. Thus may this great resource be preserved, and rendered subservient, in peace and in war, to the common benefit of all the States composing the Union.

The inquiry remains, what ought to be the specific application of the fund under the restriction stated? After deducting the ten per cent. proposed to be set apart for the new States, a portion of the committee would have preferred that the residue should be applied to the objects of internal improvement, and colonization of the free blacks, under the direction of the General Government. But a majority of the committee believes it better, as an alternative for the scheme of cession to the new States, and as being most likely to give general satisfaction, that the residue be divided among the twenty-four States, according to their federal representative population, to be applied to education, internal improvement, or colonization, or to the redemption of any existing debt contracted for internal improvements, as each State, judging for itself, shall deem most conformable with its own interests and policy. Assuming the annual product of the sales of the public lands to be three millions of dollars, the table hereto annexed, marked C, shows what each State would be entitled to receive, according to the principle of division which has been stated. In order that the propriety of the proposed appropriation should again, at a day not very far distant, be brought under the review of Congress, the committee would recommend that it be limited to a period of five years, subject to the condition of war not breaking out in the mean time. By an appropriation so restricted as to time, each State will be enabled to estimate the probable extent of its proportion, and to adapt its measures of education, improvement, or colonization, or extinction of existing debt accordingly.

In conformity with the views and principles which the committee have now submitted, they beg leave to report the accompanying bill, entitled "An act to appropriate, for a limited time, the proceeds of the sales of the public lands of the United States."

A.

Letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting reports as to the quantity of public lands unsold; the quantity granted for internal improvements, education, and to charitable institutions; the amount paid for title to public lands; the expenses incurred in the sale of the public lands, and in settling titles of claimants, and the amount received for lands sold.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, April 6, 1832.

SIR: In compliance with the two resolutions of the House of Representatives, passed on the 25th of January last, in the following terms:

"Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be requested to furnish this House with a statement showing the quantity, in acres, of public land unsold at the time of the last quarterly return of sales, and within the limits of the several States and organized Territories, distinguishing that part to which the Indian title had been extinguished; also the number of acres which have been appropriated for internal improvements, education, or charitable institutions, showing, under separate heads, the quantity of land unsold in each State and Territory, and to what States

and Territories, or bodies politic, grants of land have been made, and the quantity to each.

“Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury inform this House what amount of money has been paid by the United States for the title to the public lands, including the payments made under the Louisiana and Florida treaties, the compact with Georgia; the settlement with the Yazoo claimants; the contracts with the several Indian tribes, and the expenditures for compensation to commissioners, clerks, surveyors, and other officers employed by the United States for the management and sale of the Western domain; also, the gross amount of money received at the public Treasury as the proceeds of sales of public lands, and the sum still due from supposed solvent purchasers;”

I have the honor to transmit a statement from the Commissioner of the General Land Office, marked (a,) containing the information required by the first resolution; and a statement from the Register, marked (b,) containing that required by the second resolution.

In answer to the inquiry respecting “the sum still due from supposed solvent purchasers,” I have to remark, that, agreeably to law, all lands which had been further credited under the relief laws passed in the years 1821, 1822, and 1823, and which were not paid for on the 4th July, 1829, have reverted to the United States, and the moneys paid thereon are declared to be forfeited. There is, therefore, at the present time, no debt due from purchasers of public lands.

I have the honor to be, very respectfully,

Your obedient servant,

LOUIS McLANE,
Secretary of the Treasury.

To the honorable the *SPEAKER*

of the House of Representatives of the United States.

(a.) *STATEMENT rendered in pursuance of a resolution of the House of Representatives of 25th January, 1832.*

State or Territory.	Estimated amount of acres unsold of lands to which the Indian and foreign titles have been extinguished.	Estimated amount of acres to which the Indian title has not been extinguished.	Appropriated for internal improvements, education, or charitable institutions.					Lands appropriated for seats of government.	Saline reservations.	Aggregate appropriations for each State and Territory.
			Number of acres for internal im- provements.	Number of acres for colleges, a- cademies, and universities.	The one thirty- sixth part of public lands appropriated for common schools.	For religious and charitable insti- tutions.				
Ohio	5,242,221	344,613	922,937	*92,800	678,376	‡43,525	-	2,560	-	1,737,838
Indiana	12,699,096	3,681,040	384,728	46,080	‡556,184	-	23,040	2,560	23,040	1,012,592
Illinois	28,237,859	3,158,110	480,600	46,080	977,457	-	206,128	2,560	206,128	1,712,225
Missouri	34,547,152	3,744,000	-	46,080	1,086,639	-	46,080	2,449	46,080	1,181,248
Mississippi	21,211,465	6,529,280	-	46,080	685,884	-	-	1,280	-	733,244
Alabama	20,167,725	7,760,890	400,000	46,560	722,190	‡23,040	23,040	1,620	23,040	1,216,450
Louisiana	25,198,234	-	-	46,080	875,973	-	-	10,000	-	920,053
Michigan	17,883,681	82,905,536	-	46,080	543,893	-	-	-	-	599,973
Arkansas	31,912,381	288,000	-	46,080	950,258	-	-	-	-	996,338
Florida	30,194,070	5,166,500	-	46,080	877,484	‡23,040	-	1,120	-	947,724
Aggregate, †	227,293,884	113,577,869	2,187,665	508,000	7,952,538	89,605	21,589	298,288	-	11,057,685

* Including Salt-spring reservations, which are authorized to be sold by the State, and the proceeds applied to literary purposes.

† Including lands appropriated for schools in Clark's grant.

‡ Section No. 29, appropriated for religious purposes, in the purchases made by John C. Symmes and the Ohio Company.

§ For the benefit of the Connecticut Deaf and Dumb Asylum.

|| For the benefit of the Kentucky Deaf and Dumb Asylum.

¶ The aggregate of unsold lands is to the 31st December, 1831.

GENERAL LAND OFFICE, April 2, 1832.

ELIJAH HAYWARD.

(b.)

STATEMENT of the amount of money which has been paid by the United States for the title to the public lands, including the payments made under the Louisiana and Florida treaties ; the compact with Georgia ; the settlement with the Yazoo claimants ; the contracts with the several Indian tribes ; and the expenditures for compensation to commissioners, clerks, surveyors, and other officers employed by the United States for the management and sale of the Western domain ; also, the gross amount of money received at the public Treasury, as the proceeds of sales of public lands, stated in pursuance of the resolution of the House of Representatives of the 25th of January, 1832.

Payment on account of the purchase of Louisiana :			
Principal	-	-	\$14,984,872 28
Interest on \$11,250,000	-	-	8,529,353 43
			<u>\$23,514,225 71</u>
Payment on account of the purchase of Florida :			
Principal	-	-	\$4,985,599 82
Interest to 30th Sept., 1831,			1,265,416 67
			<u>6,251,016 49</u>
Payment of compact with Georgia	-	-	- 1,065,484 06
Payment of the settlement with the Yazoo claimants	-	-	- 1,830,808 04
Payment of contracts with the several Indian tribes (all expenses on account of Indians)	-	-	- 11,852,182 56
Payment of commissioners, clerks, and other officers employed by the United States for the management and sale of the Western domain	-	-	- 3,563,834 54
			<u><u>\$48,077,551 40</u></u>
Amount of money received at the Treasury, as the proceeds of public lands, to the 30th September, 1831,			
			<u><u>\$37,272,713 31</u></u>

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,

Register's Office, Feb. 7, 1832.

T. L. SMITH, Register.

B.

A statement exhibiting various comparative views of the progress of the population of the United States, and in different States, derived from the census of 1820, and the census of 1830.

According to pop. in 1820.	Population in 1820.	Population in 1830.	According to pop. in 1830.	States accord- ing to ratio of increase.	Rates of in- crease from 1820 to '30.	Actual increase from 1820 to 1830.	According to actual increase.
24	55,211	157,445	20	Illinois -	185.16	102,234	10
19	127,901	309,527	15	Alabama -	142.00	181,626	6
18	147,178	343,031	13	Indiana -	133.07	195,853	5
23	66,586	140,455	21	Missouri -	110.93	73,869	15
21	75,448	136,621	21	Mississippi -	81.07	61,173	17
9	420,813	681,904	7	Tennessee -	62.04	261,091	
5	581,434	935,884	4	Ohio -	60.96	354,450	2
11	340,989	516,823	10	Georgia -	51.56	175,834	7
17	153,407	215,739	19	Louisiana -	40.63	62,332	16
1	1,372,812	1,913,131	1	New York -	39.36	540,319	1
12	298,335	399,437	12	Maine -	33.88	101,102	11
3	1,049,313	1,348,233	2	Pennsylvania -	28.48	298,920	3
6	561,317	687,917	6	Kentucky -	21.90	123,600	9
16	235,764	280,657	17	Vermont -	19.04	44,893	18
20	83,059	97,194	23	Rhode Island -	17.01	14,135	23
7	523,287	610,403	8	Massachusetts -	16.64	87,121	13
8	502,741	581,185	9	South Carolina -	15.60	78,444	14
13	277,575	320,823	14	New Jersey -	15.58	43,248	19
4	638,829	737,987	5	North Carolina -	15.52	99,158	12
2	1,065,366	1,211,405	3	Virginia -	13.70	146,039	8
15	244,161	269,328	18	New Hampshire -	10.30	25,167	21
10	407,350	447,040	11	Maryland -	9.74	39,690	20
14	275,248	297,675	16	Connecticut -	8.14	22,427	22
22	72,749	76,748	24	Delaware -	5.49	3,999	24
	9,579,873	12,716,597			32.74	3,136,724	

Population of the 24 States in 1820, 9,579,873
Do do in 1830 12,716,597

Actual increase 3,136,724

Rate of increase 32.74

Of the 11 States whose ratio of in-
crease is greater in the annexed
table than 32.74, the aggregate
population was, in 1820 - 3,640,114
Do do in 1830 - 5,749,997

Actual increase 2,109,883

Ratio of increase 57.96

Of these 11 States, the 7 containing
the public domain had a popula-
tion, in 1820, of - 1,207,165
Do do 1830, - 2,238,702

Actual increase 1,031,537

Ratio of increase 85.43

The remaining 4 of the 11, viz.

Tennessee, Georgia, N. York and

Maine had a pop. in 1820, of - 2,432,949
Do do in 1830, - 3,511,295

Actual increase 1,078,346

Rate of increase 44.32

The 17 States having none of the
pub. lands, had a pop. in 1820, of 8,372,707
Do do in 1830, - 10,477,895

Actual increase 2,105,188

Rate of increase 25.14

The 13 States whose increase ac-
cording to the annexed table is
below 32.74, had a pop. in '20 of 5,939,759
Do do in 1830 6,966,600

Actual increase - 1,026,841

Rate of increase - 17.28

In 1820, the population of the seven States containing the public lands, viz. Illinois, Alabama, Indiana, Missouri, Mississippi, Ohio, and Louisiana, bore to the whole population of the United States, the proportion of 1 to 7.95, or about $\frac{1}{8}$. In 1830, it was at 1 to 5.23, a little less than $\frac{1}{5}$.

In 1820, the population of the same seven States was to the population of the remaining 17 States as 1 to 6.94, or about $\frac{1}{7}$. In 1830, it was as 1 to 4.68, more than $\frac{1}{5}$ and nearly $\frac{3}{10}$.

In 1820, the population of the same seven States was to that of the remaining four of the 11 whose increase is above the common ratio, viz. Tennessee, Georgia, New York, and Maine, as 1 to 2.015, or something less than $\frac{1}{5}$. In 1830, it was as 1 to 1.55, or about $\frac{2}{5}$.

In 1820, the population of the same seven States was to that of the 13 States whose increase is below the common ratio, as 1 to 4.92, or about $\frac{1}{5}$. In 1830, it was 1 to 3.11, or about $\frac{1}{3}$.

In 1820, the population of the seven land States was about $\frac{1}{8}$ of the population of all the States. Their increase in 10 years, is to the whole increase as 1 to 3.04, or about $\frac{1}{3}$.

In 1820, the population of these seven States was equal to about $\frac{1}{7}$ of that of the other 17 States. The increase of the former in 10 years, is to that of the latter as 1 to 2.04 or about $\frac{1}{5}$.

In 1820, the population of these seven States equalled about $\frac{2}{3}$ of that of the four other States whose increase is above the common ratio, viz. Tennessee, Georgia, New York, and Maine. The increase of the former in 10 years, is to that of the latter as 1 to 1.04, or very nearly equal.

In 1820, the population of these seven States was about $\frac{1}{5}$ of that of the 13 States whose increase is below the common ratio. The increase of these former in 10 years, is to that of the latter as 1 to 0.995, a little more than equal.

GENERAL LAND OFFICE,
January 28, 1836.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of 23d inst. propounding various inquiries as to the practical operation of the pre-emption laws: whether any frauds have been practised upon the Government under the color of those laws, and, if so, of what nature, and to what extent; whether, in my opinion, it is practicable to guard against their repetition, if those laws continue in force, &c., and have to state that, in the midst of my accumulated duties, I cannot probably better answer those inquiries than by transmitting the enclosed copy of a letter of this date to the Secretary of the Treasury, on a call from the Committee on Public Lands in the House of Representatives.

As all the documents which it is intended to send with that report cannot be copied to-day, I have concluded to send the enclosed without delay, and the copies hereafter.

With great respect,
Your obedient servant,

ETHAN A. BROWN,
Commissioner.

HON. THOMAS EWING,
Chairman of the Committee on Public Lands, Senate.

GENERAL LAND OFFICE,

January 28, 1836.

SIR: You have been pleased to refer to me a letter from the Hon. A. G. Harrison, accompanied by a resolution of the Committee on Public Lands; the letter advising you that a bill granting pre-emption to actual settlers, then before the committee, had been drawn with an eye particularly directed to the frauds alleged to have been committed, and expressing that the great desire of the committee to adopt such provisions as will prevent the future possibility of such frauds, had led to the communication, believing that you may have it in your power to give additional light on the subject. The resolution of the committee aforesaid being in these words: "*Resolved*, That the resolution of the House, instructing the committee to inquire into the expediency of modifying the different acts of Congress granting pre-emption rights to settlers on the public lands, so as to protect the rights of settlers and prevent frauds against the United States," "be referred to the Secretary of the Treasury, and that he be requested to furnish the committee with the best plan which occurs to him, of securing the right of pre-emption to actual settlers and of preventing said frauds." I have attentively considered the said letter and resolution, and have the honor to report:

The Committee on Public Lands apply to you, sir, for "all the information in your Department concerning the alledged frauds."

Most of the knowledge possessed by the General Land Office concerning frauds practised in relation to pre-emptions, of which I am now able to speak, consists of uncontradicted general reports, in general currency and credit; of oral communications to me, and letters to me and others, from persons in high standing; most of the writers either requesting that their names may not be published, or not giving authority for such publication. The terms of these communications are rarely sufficiently specific and tangible to fix particular instances, except in the cases of interested correspondents, some of whose representations have been verified, others not; while want of time and opportunity have delayed an investigation of the greater part of this last class.

The requisition of the committee above mentioned, is sufficiently comprehensive in terms to include every case and its circumstances, as well as the general representations that have reached this office. I must take the liberty to observe that a literal compliance with the requisition cannot be speedily yielded. It would render the report very voluminous, and require to search the files of an immense correspondence, and the investigation of many tens of thousands of pre-emption cases reported, which we have not yet been able to take up for examination. To particularize every exceptionable case, even of those that have attracted attention since the act of 1834 has been in operation, would require more time in the revision and narration than would seem to comport with the desire of the committee to act soon upon the bill alluded to by Mr. Harrison; and, therefore, with your permission, I will confine myself, on this occasion, to the imputations currently believed, and general heads of impositions attempted and practised, which have been detected in some of the contested cases examined, or which common fame has represented as having been but too common, in some quar-

ters; and without comment on the conspicuous cases of the military reservations at Chicago, and the missionary stations in Mississippi, I proceed to remark that the loudest and most numerous complaints, arising from the pre-emption policy, that have reached the General Land Office, have been against the alleged abuse of the privilege commonly called floating claims. Some who claim to be bona fide cultivators and occupiers under the act of 1834, complain of being vexed and disturbed by these "floats." A more numerous class, not comprised in the provisions of the act, are said not to be the less clamorous because the floats have been *lawfully* located on their chosen spots; but chiefly the virtuous and patriotic citizens of Louisiana have been disgusted and alarmed by the extent to which fraud and perjury is asserted to have been carried in the manufacture of such claims within that interesting State, threatening to cover a large portion of the most valuable lands that have been surveyed. These representations are made by individuals in highly respectable standing, besides our own officers. And it is said on creditable authority, that preparations appear to be making, in hopes of a pre-emption act at this session of Congress, to acquire by such means, at minimum cost, a great part of the precious lands on Red river. No particular instance of these practices has been indicated to me, but the opinion is prevalent that they are transacted. It is believed that the number of bona fide pre-emptions in Louisiana is comparatively small, as information derived from persons distinguished by public confidence in that State represents a belief that a claim to pre-emption was not often heard of on the island of New Orleans, nor west of the Mississippi, before this multiplication of "floats" was devised to be laid on the finest vacant lands.

This iniquitous scheme appears to be of late date in that region, as the first intelligence of it seems to have been communicated to the General Land Office some time after it was placed in my charge. Agreeably to your direction, sir, circumspection and vigilance were recommended to the land officers in Louisiana, in order to guard against imposition; and I ventured to direct the Surveyor General to retain the plats in his hands which were destined for the land offices, until further orders. Other steps have recently been taken at this office, to put in train a rigorous scrutiny into the legitimacy of the floating pretensions in that State. Letters and copies of letters on this subject, Nos. — to —; are herewith transmitted. Contrivances have been brought to light in other places, showing where a family occupying the same tenement, where father and son, and mother and son, dwelling together, have set up the pretence of separate cultivation and occupancy, to divide a quarter section, and obtain a float for each half.

Claimants of another reprehensible description are they whose pretensions are founded on depositions in general terms, or wearing the appearance of being artfully worded, admitting a subterfuge in the attempt to give a legal coloring to their proceedings, by construing the statute to suit their purposes. The law, as its title imports, is in favor of *settlers*; but pretensions have been set up by persons dwelling in town with their families, and there following mercantile or other pursuits, while they caused a little show of improvement, that scarce deserved the name, to be made for them by others; no proof being produced of their personal superintendence or direction on the spot. Cultivation by slaves or

hirelings in 1833, and one or the other, or a growing crop on the place on the following 19th of June, have been assumed as fulfilling the required conditions.

Among the pretences to cultivation, there have been disclosures, as follows, viz.: where the cutting and burning a small patch of cane; where an enclosure, not entitled to be called a fence, around a space only large enough for a very small garden, and the planting a few culinary vegetables; and where scattering an undefined quantity of turnip or grass seeds; and, in one case, planting a few turnips or onions, have been claimed as cultivation, to meet this condition. Further remarks upon constructive possession may be dispensed with.

The registers and receivers are made judges of the credibility and sufficiency of the proofs, except in contested cases, which are required to be sent to the Commissioner for decision.

My predecessor ordered the evidence in every case to be forwarded; but, during near five months of my superintendence, it has been quite impossible to scrutinize the proof in about sixteen hundred of the former class, without neglecting duties that appeared more pressing and imperative. In those examined, contradictions, prevarications, and other circumstances, have occasionally placed parties and witnesses in no favorable point of view.

In the contested class, the land offices must be presumed, *prima facie*, to have acted correctly. If honest, they would not knowingly pass a fraudulent claim: if conniving, they will hardly be expected to expose themselves voluntarily. The necessary quantum of evidence can hardly be prescribed, the same proof being more or less convincing to the different persons.

The bill mentioned by Mr. Harrison as having for subject the granting of pre-emptions to actual settlers, and to prevent the future possibility of such frauds as are alleged to have been committed, forms no part of your reference, and it would, perhaps, be improper to allude to it in this place, if the letter did not seem to indicate an intention on the part of the writer, and of the committee to which he belongs, to extend the grants of pre-emption to others than those who come within the provisions of the act of 1834. Believing such a disposition to be implied, and that a new law to that effect will go far to form the pre-emption policy into a durable system, involving considerations of great importance to the Treasury, and materially affecting the land establishment under my particular charge, I hope it will not be considered officious or impertinent to submit a few remarks, though not expressly called for, upon the hypothesis that such an extension of the pre-emption privilege is contemplated.

The pre-emption laws originated and bestowed rights, but recognised none in the settlers as previously existing. I conceive they have no other rights in this respect than what the law confers; and that the pre-emption privilege may be considered little else than a mere benevolence, enabling the adventurer to appropriate to himself the choicest lands, most valuable mill seats, and localities for towns, at a vast cost to the public; or, in other words, preventing the receipt of vast sums into the Treasury. It is confidently believed that these privileges, covering at least four millions of acres of land, joined with outrageous combinations to in-

timidate purchasers, and other unjustifiable confederacies, have diminished the receipt for public lands, in the year 1835, full three millions of dollars, at a moderate estimate, below what they would have brought in fair competition. If frauds in pre-emption were unknown; if no one obtained a pre-emption but upon a faithful compliance with the conditions prescribed, still, the selections of the most valuable lands and most desirable situations, at the minimum price, would produce an effect upon the revenue too considerable to be overlooked by the financier. I should step out of my province as Commissioner, by arguing, officially, the questions, whether other considerations of public policy counterbalance this cost, or whether the settlers have extraordinary merits transcending this calculation, and accordingly abstain from the discussion.

If the propriety were conceded of making the pre-emption policy a part of our land system, there would be still no evident fitness in extending the concession to a full quarter section of land. An allowance of half that quantity of the very best land is surely munificent; and if presumed poverty be one of the considerations for the grant, it may be observed that many a good farm in the West contains no more than an eighth of a section.

The committee request you, sir, to furnish them with the best plan which occurs to you, of securing the right of pre-emption to actual settlers, and of preventing said frauds, viz. against the United States.

In relation to the first branch of this request, I have to observe, that the act of 1834, and the precautions already taken by the Commissioner, with the advice and approbation of the Secretary of the Treasury, appear to have provided sufficiently for the fair claimants under the present law.

The resolution is silent respecting the nature and extent of any future grants of this kind that may be contemplated, and the difficulty of devising a plan for their protection, under such circumstances, must be apparent.

The second part of the request presents a difficulty extraordinary. The temptation to abuse the charity of the Legislature is so radically intermixed, and so inextricably interwoven with the operation of the pre-emption laws, that I should despair of laying before you a plan altogether effectual for the prevention of fraud on the part of claimants. It seems to me a hopeless task to project any modification of existing enactments, that shall silence perjury and defeat the devices of sagacious speculators, so long as their ingenuity shall be sharpened and stimulated by the prospect of an immense gain attending their success. The conscientious will resort to no dishonest tricks; but the contagion of speculation is proverbial; and when an expectation may be entertained of obtaining, by indirection, for the lowest price, land worth from five to forty dollars per acre in the market, the inducement to perjury and fraudulent shifts will be too strong to be resisted by many of weaker morality. A scheme of extreme liberality towards the settlers might diminish the number of fraudulent cases, by partially removing the motive to such practices; but I do not imagine any project to defeat them altogether, so long as there remain legal restrictions upon the invasion of the public property by unlicensed intruders, who, by a statute unrepealed, are considered as trespassers, liable to be prosecuted as such, and to be forcibly removed, at

the discretion of the President, as has heretofore been done. It will be seen, in the preceding remarks, that protection of the rights bestowed by the pre-emption act of 1834, is considered to be well provided for by that act, and by the liberal construction it has received, in instructions that have emanated under your sanction; and that similar provisions will suffice for similar cases in future concessions of the pre-emption privilege.

The practices by which the United States have been most defrauded in claims of this nature, are believed to consist, principally, of the misstatements or improper coloring of facts, and the evasions and prevarications of parties and witnesses. To obviate such iniquitous proceedings, it will be proper to provide a mode of subjecting the deponents to the test of a rigorous interrogation and cross-examination. I ask leave, however, to suggest that the interest of the treasury seems to demand a guard against force as well as fraud. I allude to that system of terror that threatens the competitor for the purchase of public land with the vengeance of the settler with whose usurpation he may interfere. In some quarters, this state of things is become formidable; probably finding its origin, in a great measure, in the pre-emption laws, whose repeated enactment may have led the settlers to the erroneous persuasion that they have acquired rights not given by law. Be this as it may, experience has shown that by mutual support and open menace, they have succeeded in deterring others from bidding against them at the public sales; and it is evident that the prospect for the future is not less threatening. The injurious effect of the continuance of such acts upon the treasury will be obvious to you.

Respectfully submitted.

E. A. BROWN, *Commissioner.*

To Hon. LEVI WOODBURY,
Secretary of the Treasury.

[Documents appended to Report No. 89.]

No. 1.

A TABLE showing the amount received for the sales of public lands in each State and Territory, to the 30th September, 1835.

Year.	Ohio.	Indiana.	Illinois.
From 1796 to } 1800 inclusive }	\$100,783 59		
1801	168,125 01		
1802	188,628 02		
1803	165,675 69		
1804	487,526 79		
1805	540,193 80		
1806	765,245 73		
1807	433,839 47	\$13,000 50	
1808	594,400 84	32,830 51	
1809	395,451 19	41,431 57	
1810	569,964 80	51,448 59	
1811	886,821 21	75,794 99	
1812	552,900 51	92,973 49	
1813	691,324 13	70,533 40	
1814	885,269 30	158,308 27	
1815	974,396 75	172,426 80	\$35,000 00
1816	993,313 07	341,487 34	55,105 96
1817	1,080,428 54	672,326 98	95,244 44
1818	902,311 88	538,318 93	368,038 80
1819	552,986 29	507,997 42	299,461 58
1820	398,260 62	400,423 42	134,355 15
1821	267,195 17	342,144 04	75,595 19
1822	472,075 87	444,359 35	61,216 82
1823	203,098 16	222,256 66	47,600 34
1824	234,330 01	203,082 11	74,669 37
1825	234,895 75	199,899 57	50,784 49
1826	184,548 92	256,187 19	108,341 14
1827	306,105 34	343,887 08	50,717 52
1828	161,609 92	318,418 06	88,161 80
1829	187,909 53	348,959 52	198,609 72
1830	144,510 84	627,181 75	396,204 31
1831	304,386 22	572,654 12	375,260 27
1832	360,641 14	527,366 48	228,292 69
1833	475,812 82	459,839 82	374,138 51
1834	471,394 50	769,584 32	402,470 68
To 30th Sept., } 1835, }	443,815 62	705,359 93	1,836,343 21
	16,730,177 04	9,510,481 71	5,355,611 99

TABLE No. 1—Continued.

Year.	Missouri.	Alabama.	Mississippi.	Louisiana.
From 1796 to 1800 in- clusive }				
1801				
1802				
1803				
1804				
1805				
1806				
1807	—	—	\$19,323 80	
1808	—	\$620 00	20,087 71	
1809	—	320 00	5,049 57	
1810	—	36,087 12	39,048 31	
1811	—	46,388 24	31,333 09	
1812	—	54,247 75	10,306 03	
1813	—	42,359 61	31,438 00	
1814	—	74,847 07	17,546 45	
1815	—	32,540 30	73,595 43	
1816	—	162,520 66	165,558 00	
1817	—	51,617 59	91,608 51	
1818	\$57,524 87	573,761 41	95,500 00	
1819	635,721 64	1,167,957 62	74,660 20	
1820	148,645 50	431,025 65	116,104 31	
1821	99,327 18	306,097 79	68,379 70	\$46,733 20
1822	139,603 10	520,505 65	74,215 34	78,000 00
1823	55,307 14	295,585 79	13,957 36	16,380 11
1824	126,318 02	204,312 36	88,477 94	3,000 00
1825	87,853 92	215,916 68	188,264 66	14,295 01
1826	66,882 59	443,219 96	148,535 06	23,812 10
1827	188,341 52	127,232 36	88,995 16	120,543 08
1828	156,723 83	104,868 83	101,611 55	15,876 34
1829	235,013 29	259,606 31	116,648 87	28,000 00
1830	224,609 03	475,471 71	148,254 07	76,730 50
1831	341,994 05	925,028 26	173,780 93	83,870 93
1832	305,624 72	451,886 36	307,900 51	100,455 00
1833	334,860 02	531,722 54	1,153,054 83	108,018 09
1834	244,947 63	1,003,156 56	1,189,228 92	106,315 58
To 30th Septem- ber, 1835 }	436,916 50	1,558,543 50	2,185,306 14	177,057 53
	3,886,224 55	10,097,347 68	6,837,770 45	999,087 47

TABLE No 1—Continued.

Year.	Michigan.	Arkansas.	Florida.	Total in each year.
From 1796 to 1800 in- clusive }	—	—	—	\$100,783 59
1801	—	—	—	168,125 01
1802	—	—	—	188,628 02
1803	—	—	—	165,675 69
1804	—	—	—	487,526 79
1805	—	—	—	540,193 80
1806	—	—	—	765,245 73
1807	—	—	—	466,163 27
1808	—	—	—	647,939 06
1809	—	—	—	442,252 33
1810	—	—	—	696,548 82
1811	—	—	—	1,040,237 53
1812	—	—	—	710,427 78
1813	—	—	—	835,655 14
1814	—	—	—	1,135,971 09
1815	—	—	—	1,287,959 28
1816	—	—	—	1,717,985 03
1817	—	—	—	1,991,226 06
1818	\$71,108 88	—	—	2,606,564 77
1819	35,638 03	—	—	3,274,422 78
1820	7,056 96	—	—	1,635,871 61
1821	7,494 19	—	—	1,212,966 46
1822	10,786 41	\$2,819 00	—	1,803,581 54
1823	38,797 95	23,529 59	—	916,523 10
1824	50,026 01	202 33	—	984,418 15
1825	138,376 76	5,079 42	\$80,724 30	1,216,090 56
1826	122,250 51	10,908 00	29,099 62	1,393,785 09
1827	59,200 70	5,226 00	205,596 50	1,495,845 26
1828	29,829 17	1,000 00	40,209 25	1,018,308 75
1829	70,275 74	1,238 00	70,914 15	1,517,175 13
1830	178,516 65	1,833 53	56,043 75	2,329,356 14
1831	388,848 07	3,955 50	40,997 13	3,210,815 48
1832	317,635 42	13,538 05	10,040 66	2,623,331 03
1833	501,272 79	18,114 27	10,847 86	3,967,681 55
1834	573,652 66	88,664 86	8,184 98	4,857,600 69
To 30th Septem- ber, 1835 }	1,359,129 68	460,493 78	3,625 00	9,166,590 89
	3,959,896 58	636,642 33	556,283 20	58,619,523 00

TABLE No. 1—Continued.

Amount paid into the Treasury, on account of			
the sales of the public land, from the earliest			
period to the 30th September, 1835, - -			
			\$58,619,523 00
There was also paid, during the same period, for			
the public land, viz :			
Certificate of public debt and army land			
warrants, - - -	-	\$984,189 91	
Mississippi stock, - - -	-	2,448,789 44	
United States stock, - - -	-	257,660 73	
Forfeited land stock and military scrip, -	-	1,719,333 53	
			<hr/>
			5,409,973 61
			<hr/>
			\$64,029,496 61
			<hr/>

A TABLE showing the quantity of land surveyed in each State and Territory, the amount sold in each, &c.

States and Territories.	Estimated superficial contents of each State and Territory.	Estimated quantity of land to which the Indian title has been extinguished by the United States, 30th September, 1835.	Quantity of land surveyed and offered for sale in each State and Territory, on the 30th September, 1835.	Quantity of land remaining unsold and liable to private entry, on the 30th September, 1835.	Quantity of land sold in each State and Territory, 30th September, 1835.	Estimated quantity of land surveyed, but not offered for sale, 30th September, 1835.	Estimated quantity of land in the States and Territories not ceded to the United States, 30th September, 1835.
	Acres.	Acres.	Acres.	Acres.	Acres.	Acres.	Acres.
Ohio	24,923,899	24,777,683	14,703,163.10	4,100,492.18	A 10,602,670.92	6,438	146,216
Indiana	22,032,469	21,020,167	18,690,447.53	10,299,608.62	8,390,838.91	299,520	1,012,332
Illinois	32,321,947	32,321,947	21,574,493.45	17,234,014.35	4,340,481.10		
Missouri	39,119,018	39,119,018	20,392,249.14	17,443,429.90	2,948,819.24		
Alabama	32,174,640	30,654,000	29,915,088.56	22,586,058.56	7,329,030.00	158,621	1,520,640
Mississippi	27,487,200	27,487,200	B 17,525,818.82	11,924,301.48	5,601,517.34	1,382,490	400,000
Louisiana	31,463,040	—	6,450,942.05	5,683,526.98	767,415.07	4,035,040	600,900
Arkansas	37,555,200	36,955,200	13,891,538.31	13,223,175.80	668,362.51	829,440	7,020,160
Michigan, Peninsula	24,209,567	17,189,407	12,211,519.37	9,003,697.49	3,207,821.88	599,040	68,427,520
Michigan, west of lake	77,251,840	8,824,520	4,674,690.71	4,524,935.96	149,754.75		
Florida	55,286,760	30,000,000	6,867,129.87	6,374,220.71	492,909.16	2,442,240	
Totals	383,825,580	268,348,942	166,897,082.91	122,397,462.03	44,499,620.88	9,772,739	79,126,838

Estimated quantity of land within the limits of the United States, west of the Mississippi river, and west of the organized limits of States and Territories—715,000,000 acres.

A. This quantity includes the lands sold at New York and Pittsburg, and the special sales to John Cleves Symmes and the Ohio Company, prior to the organization of the district land offices.

B. The lands ceded to the United States by the Chickasaw Indians, lying within the limits of the States of Mississippi and Alabama, by the treaty of 1832, and estimated to contain 6,422,400 acres, are not included in the lands "surveyed and offered for sale" in those States.

GENERAL LAND OFFICE, January 15, 1836.

ETHAN A. BROWN, Commissioner.

No. 3.

EXHIBIT of the nett quantity of public lands sold, and the amount paid by purchasers, from the earliest period of sales to the 30th of September, 1835.

Date.	Quantity sold.	Amount paid by purchasers.
	Acres.	
From the year 1796 to June 30, 1820,	*13,649,641.10	\$27,663,964 60
From July 1 to December 31, 1820,	303,404.09	424,962 26
In the year - - - 1821,	781,213.32	1,169,224 98
" - - - 1822,	801,226.18	1,023,267 83
" - - - 1823,	653,319.52	850,136 26
" - - - 1824,	749,323.04	953,799 03
" - - - 1825,	893,461.69	1,205,068 37
" - - - 1826,	848,082.26	1,128,617 27
" - - - 1827,	926,727.76	1,318,105 36
" - - - 1828,	965,600.36	1,221,357 99
" - - - 1829,	1,244,860.01	1,572,863 54
" - - - 1830,	1,929,733.79	2,433,432 94
" - - - 1831,	2,777,856.88	3,557,023 76
" - - - 1832,	2,462,342.16	3,115,376 09
" - - - 1833,	3,856,227.56	4,972,284 84
" - - - 1834,	4,658,218.71	6,099,981 04
1st, 2d, and 3d quarters of - 1835,	†6,999,378.12	8,869,483 57
Aggregate to September 30, - 1835,	44,500,616.55	\$67,578,949 73

*The sales and payments made by purchasers are stated in the aggregate for the whole period of the credit system which terminated on the 30th June, 1820, in order to exhibit the nett amount of sales under that system, after deducting all lands which reverted to the United States by reason of the non-compliance of purchasers with the terms of contract ; and, also, those which were relinquished by purchasers under the provisions of the various relief laws, which commenced in the year 1821.

† These aggregates include the special sales made prior to the organization of the land districts ; also the amount of forfeited land stock, Mississippi stock, United States stock, and military land scrip.

A.

STATEMENT showing the quantity of land unsold, and liable to private entry in each of the districts of the State of Ohio, on the 1st of January, 1835.

In what year offered for sale.	Acres.	Acres.
Marietta, prior to 1800 - - -	9,480.00	
in 1805 - - -	285,995.87	295,475.87
Steubenville, 1800 - - -	—	10,697.77
Chillicothe, prior to 1808* - - -	—	827,660.00
Zanesville, 1803 - - -	—	338,797.41
Cincinnati, in 1801, except the reserved sections, which were not offered at the minimum price of \$1 25 per acre till 1824 - - -	—	165,235.00
Wooster, 1808 - - -	—	23,216.09
Bucyrus, 1817 - - -	23,175.18	
1820 - - -	235,903.32	
1821 - - -	229,991.76	
1822 - - -	207,370.04	
1832 - - -	1,556.46	697,996.76
Lima, 1820, 1821, and 1823 - - -	—	1,951,288.00
Total -		4,310,366.90

* With a few exceptions.

B.

STATEMENT showing the quantity of land unsold and liable to private entry, in each of the districts of the State of Indiana, on the 1st of January, 1835.

In what year offered for sale.	Acres.	Acres.
Cincinnati, 1801* - - -	53,528	228,504
1811 - - -	174,976	
Jeffersonville, 1807 - - -	142,280.43	1,333,479.68
1808 - - -	496,671.54	
1807 and 1808 - - -	58,148.42	
1803 and 1816 - - -	70,520.45	
1808, 1816, and 1820 - - -	4,841.26	
1808 and 1820 - - -	115,661.66	
1816 - - -	122,700.31	
1816 and 1820 - - -	144,576.90	
1820 - - -	178,078.71	
Vincennes, 1807 - - -	1,717,162.97	3,169,102.86
1807 and 1816 - - -	147,119.91	
1816 - - -	1,107,019.04	
1816 and 1821 - - -	33,234.52	
1821 - - -	164,626.42	
Indianapolis, 1820 - - -	108,939.38	714,206.45
1821 - - -	213,953.77	
1822 - - -	391,313.30	
Crawfordsville, 1820, 1822, 1824, 1827, 1829, and 1830 - - -	-	1,240,723.07
Fort Wayne, offered in 1823 - - -	1,074,418.04	
1825 - - -	325,445.24	2,483,961.42
1830 - - -	217,107.90	
1831 - - -	325,995.99	
1832 - - -	540,994.25	
Laporte, 1830 - - -	195,646.65	410,623.44
1831 - - -	134,974.26	
1832 - - -	80,002.53	
Total - - -	-	9,580,600.92

* The reserved sections were not offered for sale at the minimum price of \$1 25 per acre till 1824.